1 2 3 4 5 6	THOMAS A. ERICSSON, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 4982 Oronoz & Ericsson, LLC 1050 Indigo Drive, Suite 120 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 Telephone: (702) 878-2889 Facsimile: (702) 522-1542 tom@oronozlawyers.com Attorney for David Harris		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
8	DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
9 10	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff,	CASE NO.: 2:07-cr-295-KJD-GWF-1	
11	vs.	STIPULATION TO CONTINUE REVOCATION HEARING	
12	DAVID HARRIS,	(SECOND REQUEST)	
13	Defendant.		
14			
15	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, by Defendant David Harris, by and		
16	through his attorney, Thomas A. Ericsson, Esq., and the United States of America, by and		
17	through Robert Knief, Assistant United States Attorney, that the revocation hearing currently		
18	scheduled for July 31, 2018, at the hour of 9:00 a.m	., be vacated and continued for at least	
19	sixty (60) days, until after the trial date on Septemb	er 10, 2018, in <u>United States v. Harris</u> ,	
20	2:18-cr-092-RFB-PAL, to a date and time that is convenient to this Honorable Court.		
21	The request for a continuance is based upon the following:		
22	1. The Defendant, David Harris, is scheduled	to proceed to trial on September 10, 2018,	
23	in <u>United States v. Harris</u> , 2:18-cr-092-RFB the revocation hearing in the instant case sho		
24	Mr. Harris' new case.	oute of continued to a date after the trial in	
25	2. Counsel for Mr. Harris and the Government jointly request that the revocation hearing date be continued for at least 60 days.		
26	3. Mr. Harris is currently in custody and has no	o objection to the continuance.	
27			

1	4. The additional time requested by this Stipulation to Continue Revocation Hearing is reasonable pursuant to Fed.R.Crim.P. Rule 32(b)(2), which states that the "court may,				
2		for good cause, change any time limits prescribed in this rule.			
3	5.	5. The additional time requested herein is not sought for the pur	poses of undue delay.		
4	6.	6. Additionally, denial of this request for a continuance could	result in a miscarriage of		
5		justice.			
6	DATE	D. (TDD 1.1. 27. 2010)			
7	DATED: July 27, 2018 Page partfully submitted				
8	Respectfully submitted,				
9		Thomas A. Ericsson /s/Robert Knief			
10	Thomas A. Ericsson, Esq. Robert Knief Oronoz & Ericsson, LLC Assistant United States Attorney		Attorney		
11		0 Indigo Dr., Suite 120 District of Nevada Vegas, Nevada 89145 501 Las Vegas Blvd. So	outh, Suite 1100		
12		orney for Defendant Harris Las Vegas, Nevada, 891	101		
13	Attorney for the United States of America				
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19 20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					

1 2 3 4 5	THOMAS A. ERICSSON, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 4982 Oronoz & Ericsson, LLC 1050 Indigo Drive, Suite 120 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 Telephone: (702) 878-2889 Facsimile: (702) 522-1542 tom@oronozlawyers.com Attorney for David Harris				
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
7					
8	DISTRICT OF NEVADA				
9					
10	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	CASE NO.: 2:07-cr-295-KJD-GWF-1			
11	Plaintiff,	FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS			
12	VS.	OF LAW, AND ORDER			
	DAVID HARRIS,				
13	Defendant.				
14					
15	FINDINGS OF FACT				
16	Based on the pending Stipulation of counsel, and good cause appearing therefore, the				
17	Court finds:				
18	ll ·	ed to proceed to trial on September 10, 2018,			
19		RFB-PAL. The parties stipulate and agree that should be continued to a date after the trial in			
20	Mr. Harris' new case.				
21		ent jointly request that the revocation hearing			
22	date be continued for at least 60 days.				
23	3. Mr. Harris is currently in custody and ha	s no objection to the continuance.			
24	1	tipulation to Continue Revocation Hearing is			
25	reasonable pursuant to Fed.R.Crim.P. Ru for good cause, change any time limits p	ale 32(b)(2), which states that the "court may, rescribed in this rule."			
26	5. The additional time requested herein is not sought for the purposes of undue delay.				
27	6. Additionally, denial of this request for a	continuance could result in a miscarriage of			
28	justice.	J			

1	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW		
2	The ends of justice served by granting said continuance outweigh the best interests of		
3	the public in proceeding with the revocation hearing as scheduled, since the failure to grant said		
4			
5	continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice, taking into account the exercise		
6	of due diligence.		
7	<u>ORDER</u>		
8	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the revocation hearing in this matter scheduled for		
9	July 31, 2018, be vacated and continued to the 2nd day of October , 2018, at		
10	the hour of		
11			
12	DATED AND DONE this 30th day of July , 2018.		
13			
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			